15845. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Empire Cotton Oil Mills. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $25. (F. & D. No. 22516. I. S. Nos. 7563–x, 13604–x.)

On July 15, 1927, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Empire Cotton Oil Mills, a corporation, Valdosta, Ga., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, in two consignments, on or about September 11, 1926, and October 30, 1926, respectively, from the State of Georgia into the State of Florida, of quantities of cottonseed meal which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Second Class Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia (actual and potential)—7.00% (Equivalent 36% protein)."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a cottonseed feed containing less than 7 per cent of ammonia, the equivalent of 36 per cent of protein, had been substituted for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Second Class Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia (actual and potential)—7.00% (Equivalent 36% protein)," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, were false and misleading in that the said statements represented that the article was second-class cottonseed meal containing 7 per cent of ammonia, the equivalent of 36 per cent of protein, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was second-class cottonseed meal containing 7 per cent of ammonia, the equivalent of 36 per cent of protein, whereas it was not second-class cottonseed meal as labeled, but was cottonseed feed containing less than 7 per cent of ammonia, the equivalent of 36 per cent of protein.

On September 19, 1927, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $25.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15846. Adulteration of celery. U. S. v. American Fruit Growers, Inc. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $25. (F. & D. No. 18473. I. S. Nos. 1853–v, 1854–v.)

On May 21, 1924, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the American Fruit Growers, Inc., a corporation, trading at Sanford, Fla., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, in part on or about April 17, 1923, and in part on or about April 19, 1923, from the State of Florida into the State of Massachusetts, of quantities of celery which was adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it contained an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, to wit, arsenic, which might have rendered it injurious to health.

On January 3, 1928, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $25.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15847. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. v. Samuel Jefferson Sligh (S. J. Sligh & Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, $25. (F. & D. No. 19002. I. S. No. 2432–v.)

On October 30, 1924, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Samuel Jefferson Sligh, trading as S. J. Sligh & Co., Orlando, Fla., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the food and drugs act, on or about April 19, 1924, from the State of Florida into the State of New York, of a quantity of oranges which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "Fancy Florida Oranges Elk Trade Mark * * * S. J. Sligh & Co. Orlando, Fla. Lake Griffin."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a product, to wit, tree dried oranges, that is, desiccated oranges had been substituted in part for fancy Florida oranges which the said article purported to be.

On April 23, 1928, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $25.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*